

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 15, and 16 are amended for form without narrowing the claims within the meaning of *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 56 USPQ2d 1865 (Fed. Cir. 2000). No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 10-16 are pending and under consideration.

**ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.116**

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because it is believed that the amendment puts this application into condition for allowance and should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised.

**ITEM 1: OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS 1, 4, AND 10-11**

The Examiner objects to claims 1, 4, and 10-11 because of the following informalities:

(c)claim 1's 3rd limitation states "one set of input devices, including the keyboard. . .". These input devices have been defined in the preamble. Claims 4 and 10-11 are objected because they incorporate claim 1's limitations.

(Action at page 2).

Independent claim 1 is amended herein to correct the informality, and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1, 4, 10 and 11 is requested.

**ITEMS 2-3: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 15-16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2**

The Examiner rejects claims 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because they depend on a canceled claim. (Action at page 2).

Claims 15-16 are amended herein so as to be dependent on claim 14, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 15 and 16 are requested.

**ITEM 6, PAGES 3-4: REJECTION OF CLAIM 1 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER KEEMUX KVM SWITCH BY NETWORK TECHNOLOGY (KEEMUX) IN VIEW OF LEE (U.S. P. 5,935,254)**

The Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over KEEMUX in view of Lee. According to aspects of the present invention, a PC switching device includes power control switches, recognizing means, selective inputting means and code transmitting means, and a power control switch does not transmit key codes when a corresponding port is not selected regardless if the corresponding port is in a power-on state. Thus, an operator cannot turn the power off unintentionally even if the operator presses the power control key for a non-selected port.

The KEEMUX-P2 Installation User guide page 2 (KEEMUX Guide) teaches a switch that allows a user to access two PS/2 computers with only one keyboard, monitor and mouse.

***Prima Facie* Obviousness Not Established**

**Features Recited In Claim 2 Not Taught By Cited Art Alone Or In Combination**

As provided in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974)."

**Plurality of Power Control Switches Not Taught**

Independent claim 1 recites a PC switching device including a plurality of power control switches corresponding respectively to the plurality of personal computers. The Examiner contends these features are taught by KEEMUX's Normal Operating Mode, since only a selected PC receives the keyboard signals. (Action at page 3).

The Examiner's interpretation of the Normal Operating Mode of the KEEMUX KVM switch is not accurate. Page 2 of the web site "NTI KEEMUX PC KVM Switch: NTI KEEMUX PC KVM Switch Solutions" (<http://www.42u.com/nti-ps2-kvm-switch.htm>) (NTI KEEMUX) discusses that in Normal Operating Mode "the user can directly operate the selected computer with transparent presence of the NTI switch."

KEEMUX does not teach, as the Examiner contends, a plurality of power control switches corresponding respectively to the plurality of personal computers.

**Recognizing Computers Correspond To Switches Firstly Pressed Not Taught**

Independent claim 1 recites a PC switching device further including "a recognizing means for recognizing that some of the plurality of personal computers, which correspond to at least one of the plurality of power control switches firstly pressed, are in a power-on state."

The Examiner contends these features are taught by KEEMUX since KEEMUX "has a LED light for each connected computer." (Action at page 3).

However, NTI KEEMUX teaches (page 2) that "LEDs indicate currently selected port and mode of operation." That is, KEEMUX does not teach recognizing that some of the plurality of personal computers, which correspond to at least one of the plurality of power control switches firstly pressed, are in a power-on state.

**Selective Inputting Means For Selectively Inputting Commands Not Taught**

Independent claim 1 recites a PC switching device further including "selective inputting means for selectively inputting commands from the keyboard without a power control key to one of the plurality of personal computer."

The Examiner contends these features are taught by KEEMUX Normal Operating mode. (Action at page 3). However, the Examiner's interpretation of the Normal Operating Mode of the KEEMUX KVM switch is not accurate.

Page 2 of NTI KEEMUX discusses that in the Normal Operating Mode "the user can directly operate the selected computer with transparent presence of the NTI switch." KEEMUX does not teach, as the Examiner contends, "selective inputting means for selectively inputting commands from the keyboard without a power control key." (Emphasis added).

**Powering Off When Computers Selected And Power Control Switches Pressed Again Not Taught**

Independent claim 1 further recites "code transmitting means for transmitting codes assigned to the power control switches to certain ones of the personal computers and powering off the same when the certain ones of the personal computers in the power-on state are selected by the selective inputting means and the power control switches that correspond to the certain ones of the personal computers in the power-on state are pressed again." The Examiner contends these features are taught by KEEMUX's Broadcast Mode. (Action at page 3).

However, the Examiner's interpretation of the KEEMUX's Broadcast Mode is not accurate. Pages 2-3 of NTI KEEMUX discusses Broadcast Mode "allows user keystrokes to be sent to all powered on computers." That is, KEEMUX does not teach, as the Examiner contends "transmitting codes assigned to the power control switches to certain ones of the personal computers and powering off the same when the certain ones of the personal computers in the power-on state are selected by the selective inputting means and the power control switches that correspond to the certain ones of the personal computers in the power-on state are pressed." (Emphasis added).

The Examiner does not contend that Lee teaches, alone or in combination, any of the above features.

**Conclusion**

Since features of independent claim 1 are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and independent claim 1 allowed.

**ITEM 6, PAGES 4-5: REJECTION OF CLAIM 2 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER KEEMUX IN VIEW OF LEE**

Independent claim 2 recites a PC switching device including "powering means for powering all of the plurality of personal computers simultaneously."

However, KEEMUX teaches a switch that is "powered by the computers it is connected

to." (See, KEEMUX guide, Power-up sequence, emphasis added).

That is KEEMUX cannot, by design, power the computers that rather power the KEEMUX.

***Prima Facie* Obviousness Not Established**

**Features Recited In Claim 1 Not Taught By Cited Art Alone Or In Combination**

As provided in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974)."

**Powering Means Not Taught**

Independent claim 2 recites a PC switching device including "powering means for powering all of the plurality of personal computers simultaneously." The Examiner contends this feature is taught by KEEMUX's Broadcast Mode.

As Applicants submitted above, the Examiners contention is not correct since the Broadcast Mode of the KEEMUX KVM Switch sends keystrokes to computers that are already powered on.

**Recognizing All Computers In Power-on State, Not Taught**

Independent claim 2 further recites a PC switching device including "recognizing means for recognizing that all of the plurality of personal computers are in the power-on state." The Examiner contends this is taught by KEEMUX's LED light. However, the LED only "indicates currently selected port and mode of operation." (See, KEEMUX page 1)

The Examiner does not contend these features are taught by Lee, alone or in combination.

**Conclusion**

Since features of independent claim 2 are not taught by the cited art and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and independent claim 2 allowed.

**ITEM 6: REJECTION OF CLAIM 3 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER KEEMUX IN VIEW OF LEE**

Independent claim 3 recites a PC switching device including "powering means for powering some of the plurality of personal computers previously selected by pressing the power control key on the keyboard when all of the plurality of personal computers are in a power-off state; (and) recognizing means for recognizing that the selected personal computers are turned."

The Examiner contends these features are taught by KEEMUX since:

. . . KEEMUX powers on a connected computer under its Normal Operating Mode,

it is the claimed powering means, which powers some of the plurality of personal computers previously selected by pressing the power control key on the keyboard when all of the plurality of personal computers are in a power-off state  
(Action at page 6).

***Prima Facie* Obviousness Not Established**

**Powering Means Recited In Claim 3 Not Taught By Cited Art Alone Or In Combination**

KEEMUX teaches a switch that is "powered by the computers it is connected to." (See, KEEMUX guide, Power-up sequence, emphasis added).

That is KEEMUX cannot, by design, power the computers that rather power the KEEMUX, let alone powering some of the plurality of personal computers previously selected by pressing the power.

**Conclusion**

Since features of independent claim 3 are not taught by the cited art and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and independent claim 3 allowed.

**ITEM 7: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4, 5, AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER KEEMUX LEE, AND KWOK (U.S.P. 4,412,245)**

The Examiner rejects dependent claims 4, 5, and 14 over KEEMUX and LEE in view of Kwok.

***Prima Facie* Obviousness Not Established**

**Features Recited In Claims 4, 5, and 14 Not Taught By Cited Art Alone Or In Combination**

Dependent claims 4, 5, and 14 recite a PC switching device including "transistors controlling connecting states between power supply terminals of the plurality of personal computers for powering the keyboard and a power receiving terminal of the keyboard."

**Transistor For Controlling Connecting States Not Taught**

The Examiner contends that Lee teaches transistor for controlling the connecting states. (Action at page 7).

However, Lee teaches (col. 5, lines 9-11) "leakage current preventing element is composed of a transistor having a base for receiving the normal power supply indication signal." Lee does not teach "transistors controlling connecting states between power supply terminals of the plurality of personal computers."

**Turning On Some Transistors Not Taught**

Dependent claims 4, 5, and 14 recite a PC switching device further including "comparators comparing a first voltage at each of the power supply terminals with a second

voltage of the power receiving terminal, and turning on some of the transistors when the former is higher than the latter, but turning off other transistors when the former is lower than the latter."

While Kwok does teach a comparator, Kwok does not teach alone or in combination, and the Examiner does not address, turning on some of the transistors when a first voltage is higher than a second voltage, but turning off other transistors when the former is lower than the latter."

### **Conclusion**

Since features of dependent claims 4, 5, and 14 are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 4, 5, and 14 allowed.

### **ITEM 7: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10 AND 12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER KEEMUX LEE, AND KWOK**

Dependent claims 10 and 12 recite a PC switching device, further comprising "first voltage dividers dividing a voltage at each of the power supply terminals; and second voltage dividers dividing a voltage at the power receiving terminal by a ratio equal to that of a corresponding one of the first voltage dividers, wherein the first voltage is a voltage divided by each of the first voltage dividers, and the second voltage is a voltage divided by each of the second voltage dividers."

The Examiner contends the features are obvious in view of KEEMUX and LEE since:

KEEMUX and Lee's disclosures are stated above; the keyboard is powered by the host computer, which provides the power for keyboard's indicative lights . . . Since the KEEMUX is between the host computer and keyboard . . . the total combined voltage for keyboard will be higher than expected if there is more than one powered host computer; thus, the voltage will need to be divided by the number of the powered host computers.

(Action at page 9).

### **Features Recited In Claims 10 and 12 Not Taught By Cited Art**

Even if *arguendo* the Examiner's argument is correct, the Examiner's contention does not address features recited in claims 10 and 12 of a first voltage is a voltage divided by each of the first voltage dividers, and the second voltage is a voltage divided by each of the second voltage dividers.

### **Examiner's Contention Unsupported**

In addition, Applicants submit that the Examiner's contention that the total combined voltage for keyboard will be "higher than expected" is unsupported. Applicants request the Examiner support the contention or withdrawn the rejection.

**Conclusion**

Since features of dependent claims 10 and 12 are not taught by the cited art, and the Examiner's contention is unsupported, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 10 and 12 allowed.

**ITEM 7: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11 AND 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER KEEMUX LEE, AND KWOK**

Dependent claims 11 and 13 recite a PC switching device "wherein the comparators are driven by power supplied from the power supply terminals of the plurality of personal computers, or from the power receiving terminal of the keyboard."

The Action concedes that KEEMUX and LEE do not teach a comparator. The Examiner contend Kwok teaches it is "known to couple a comparator's output to a transistor." (Action at pages 7-8). :

While the Examiner's coupling contention may be *arguendo* correct, Applicants submit that Kwok does not teach, alone or in combination, or in view of the Examiner's contention recite features of dependent claims 11 and 13 that a comparator is driven from power receiving terminal of a keyboard.

**Conclusion**

Since features of dependent claims 11 and 13 are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 11 and 13 allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

August 11, 2009

By:

Paul W. Bobowiec  
Paul W. Bobowiec  
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501